

**Report on the City of Chicago
School Resource Community Working Group**

December 2020

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
School Resource Officer Policy Reviewed: Special Order #S04-01-02 “School Resource Officers and Investigations at Chicago Public Schools”	4
WORKING GROUP COMPOSITION	5
Advisory Board Member	5
Working Group Members.....	5
Administrative Staff and Working Group Support.....	6
Executive Steering Committee	7
PARTICIPANT SOLICITATION AND SELECTION	8
Solicitation	8
Selection	8
SUMMARY OF MEETINGS	9
Orientation Sessions.....	9
Working Group Sessions	10
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
Process for Voting on Recommendations	13
Review of Recommendations by the Executive Steering Committee.....	13
Recommendations.....	14
CONCLUSION	14
APPENDIX 1	15
APPENDIX 2	16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Chicago Police Department (CPD) School Resource Officer (SRO) Community Working Group (CWG) is a community focused policy working group that was tasked with reviewing the current CPD SRO Policy (#S04-01-02, School Resource Officers and Investigations at Chicago Public Schools) and providing input, feedback, and recommendations to the CPD to improve this policy.

Pursuant to the Consent Decree, paragraph 41 states that “CPD will, within 60 days of the completion of the 2019-2020 school year, and on an annual basis thereafter, review and, to the extent necessary, revise its policies and practices regarding officers assigned to work in CPS schools, to ensure they are responsive to the needs of the Department, CPS, and its students...”¹

Part of the review process must include an opportunity to engage, involve, and incorporate community feedback. Any revisions to CPD’s policies and procedures regarding SROs will be submitted to the Independent Monitor (Monitor) and Illinois Office of the Attorney General (Attorney General), who oversee the City’s compliance with the Consent Decree, in accordance with the requirements of Part C of the Implementation, Enforcement and Monitoring section of the Consent Decree.

To ensure there was an effective opportunity for the community to review the policies and provide feedback for improvements, CPD partnered with the Consent Decree Community Coalition (Coalition), a group of over two dozen community organizations, to help create a community working group tasked with providing recommendations to CPD on improvements to the use of force policies. The Consent Decree Community Coalition had representatives on both the CWG Advisory Board (these members selected participants for the working group) and the CWG itself.

The CWG was comprised of nineteen individuals who came from diverse backgrounds, different levels of expertise, and various lived or direct experiences with SROs. Invitees to the CWG included members of the public, members of the Coalition, community stakeholders working in a space with an assigned SRO, and persons with lived or direct experiences.

The fundamental goal of the CWG was the ability to partner with the community to provide input, feedback, and recommendations consistent with best practices and laws applicable

¹A consent decree is a court-approved settlement agreement. This Consent Decree requires the Chicago Police Department (CPD) and the City of Chicago (the City) to reform training, policies, and practices in several areas, including use of force, community policing, impartial policing, and many others. The Consent Decree is available for review at: <http://chicagopoliceconsentdecree.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/FINAL-CONSENT-DECREE-SIGNED-BY-JUDGE-DOW.pdf>.

to the CPD on how to ensure all School Resource Officers are sufficiently trained (including de-escalation techniques to prevent or reduce the need for force), and promote trust between communities and CPD.

Planning for the CWG began in March of 2020, but was paused the following two months due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Planning resumed in May with the intention of launching the CWG in June. The application period for public participation was then extended again due to the tragic death of George Floyd in Minneapolis. The City recognized the need to allow the opportunity for more community members to apply to the CWG. The selection of CWG members was completed on September 4th, when notifications were sent via email to the selected applicants. A thank you letter was sent via email to all applicants who were not selected which encouraged future participation in other community working groups.

The CWG held its first official meeting on September 17th, 2020. The CWG was originally tasked with reviewing and making recommendations on the SRO policy over the course of four weeks. During the working group process, the group was offered the opportunity to extend the working group sessions by one week with an additional meeting to have a dialogue with CPD on the response to the group's recommendations. Members of the CWG met every Thursday evening via Zoom for two hours, where the group would address any administrative items, discuss the policy being reviewed, and make recommendations for changes to the policy.

After all recommendations were submitted by the CWG, CPD leadership met with members of the CWG to discuss the recommendations and responses. CPD agreed to accept (or accept with modification) sixteen recommendations. The accepted recommendations will be reflected in the updated SRO policy that CPD plans to implement in 2021.

School Resource Officer Policy Reviewed: Special Order #S04-01-02 “School Resource Officers and Investigations at Chicago Public Schools”

WORKING GROUP COMPOSITION

The CWG consisted of volunteer members that were committed to providing a community perspective on the existing CPD School Resource Officer policy. The Advisory Board members were volunteers who are City and national stakeholders who have a vested interest and expertise in the CPD School Resource Officer policy based upon their organizational affiliation.

The composition of the groups ensured a diverse group of individuals with different levels of expertise and experiences. There was also a dedicated administrative staff available to assist with the facilitation of the working group and to keep the goals and outcomes as a focal point of the process. Because the CWG was held virtually, the administrative staff included a neutral facilitator skilled in virtual facilitation.

Advisory Board Member

Catherine Sanchez, Policy Advisory for Public Safety, Mayor's Office (non-voting member)

Dr. Julie Burnett, Director of K-16 Policy, Education and Human Services, Mayor's Office

Jadine Chou, Chief of Safety and Security, Chicago Public Schools (CPS)

Glen Brooks Jr. Director of Community Relations, Chicago Police Department

Kylon Hooks, Director of Safety, Howard Brown Health Center

Erica Lehr, Caseworker for UCAN

Aislinn Pulley, Black Lives Matter Chicago

Chaclyn Hunt, Invisible Institute

Raul Botello, Communities United

Elizabeth Jordan, ACLU Chicago

Don Bridges, Midwest Representative, National Alliance of School Resource Officers (non-voting member)

Working Group Members

Alejandro Espinoza Olazaba, Local School Council (LSC) member at CPS High School

Ali Muhammed, CPS, High School Principal

Amy Meek, Attorney for Chicago Lawyers Committee on Civil Rights

April Tondelli, CPS, High School Educator

Arathi Jayaam, APALA Executive Board Member, Chicago Teachers Union Executive Board

Ashley Fretthold, Attorney, Legal Aid Chicago – Education Law Teams
Audrey Dunford, Community Member
Bradley Gill, CPS, Assistant High School Principal
Brittany Seay, Black United Fund of Illinois
Chelsea Biggs, LSC at CPS High School
David Stieber, CPS, High School Educator
Herschella Conyers, University of Chicago Law Department
Hilario Dominguez, LCS member at CPS High School
Juan Carlos Ocon, CPS, High School Principal
Mariah Garcia, Attorney for Mandel Legal Aid Clinic
Oswaldo Gomez, ONE Northside
Simon Shiu, LSC member at CPS High School, parent volunteer
Tashiana Stafford, Attorney, for Chicago Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights
Veronica Cortez, Attorney for Shriver Center of Poverty Law

Administrative Staff and Working Group Support

To assist with ensuring an efficient and effective review of the policy, as well as capturing the various voices and perspectives of the CWG, additional staff were committed to help facilitate. In addition to the working group volunteers, the following members were an integral part of the virtual meetings to capture feedback and assist with developing policy recommendations:

Project Manager - Catherine Sanchez, Mayor's Office
Technical Advisor - Marcia K Thompson, Esq., Hillard Heintze
Neutral Facilitator - Israel Putnam, Center for Conflict Resolution
Neutral Facilitator - Rae Kyritsi, Center for Conflict Resolution
Neutral Note taker - Jennifer Sabourin
Neutral Note taker - Jennifer Grieco
Deputy Director of Community Policing - Mike Milstein, Chicago Police Department
Policy & Training Developer - Sergeant Thomas Stoyias, Chicago Police Department, Research & Development
Policy & Training Developer - Lieutenant Michael Kapustianyk, Chicago Police Department, Research & Development
Administrative Lieutenant - Curtis Mullenix, Chicago Police Department

Project Manager The role of the project manager was to handle all administrative needs for the CWG, including communications with CWG members, drafting and dissemination of meeting documents, and acting as a liaison between CWG members and CPD members.

Technical Advisor. The role of the technical advisor was to consult all members of the executive and support teams to ensure workflow is progressing smoothly and assist in resolving any challenges. The technical advisor did not contribute any feedback into the policy discussions and focused primarily on operations of the working group.

Neutral Facilitator. The role of the working group facilitator was to guide the virtual process and to ensure all participants were heard, contributed to the process, and had a voice in the final output of the working group. The Center for Conflict Resolution (CCR) provided a pro-bono facilitator with extensive experience in mediation and knowledge of restorative and criminal justice practices.

Neutral Note takers. The neutral note takers assisted the working group facilitator in group discussions, served as a scribe, and consolidated end of session notes. The note takers were skilled at maintaining neutrality, listening, capturing key points from multiple perspectives, and synthesizing information and data in a timely manner. Neutral note takers were provided by the Technical Advisor, each serving as law clerks for Hillard Heintze and current law school students.

Executive Steering Committee

The Executive Steering Committee (ESC) was comprised of senior leadership at the Chicago Police Department:

- Acting Deputy Superintendent, Robert Boik
- Director of Community Policing, Glen Brooks Jr.
- Deputy Chief of Patrol / SRO Coordinator, Randall Darlin

This group committed to being responsible for reviewing and accepting, modifying, or declining recommendations provided by the CWG and providing written feedback to the CWG regarding any decisions made.

The ESC was available throughout the working group process to review and provide agreed upon feedback on output from the CWG and/or subcommittees if those submissions were believed to be in final draft form.

PARTICIPANT SOLICITATION AND SELECTION

Solicitation

In May 2020 the City, with the help of the technical advisor for the SRO community working group, created an online solicitation survey for participation on the CWG. The survey was open to the public and asked for social, professional, and lived experience demographical information of the candidates. The survey was available in both English and Spanish, included a direct link, and was distributed on the City's social media outlets and to organizations and individuals with experience with SROs.

The Chicago Police Department held a series of community conversations in February of 2020 across the City to allow members of the public to provide their feedback and insight into various CPD policies, including the School Resource Officer. The community members who self-identified as interested in participating in the CWG were contacted and invited to fill out the survey. Almost 100 community members filled out the survey to participate on the CWG.

Selection

CWG participants were selected by the Advisory Board. The City compiled the information from all the survey candidates into a spreadsheet with personal identifying information removed. Each applicant had a number assigned them based on the order in which they filled out the online survey. The remaining information for selection was:

- Personal number assigned to applicant
- Chicago neighborhood in which applicant resides
- Ethnicity of applicant
- Gender of applicant
- Age of applicant (range of 10 years)
- Current occupation of applicant
- Any lived experience with SROs (personal, family or friend, work or attend school with an SRO)
- If applicant is a representative of a community-based organization
- If the applicant attended any of the CPD Community Conversations (Feb 2020)
- If the applicant can attend most of the scheduled working group sessions
- Applicant provided interest statement

All information was self-identified, and applicants were not required to answer all questions to be viable.

The Advisory Board members each provided a list to the City of their preferences (some members selected up to 40). The City compiled a list of CWG members based on the number of selections the Advisory Board members selected. The highest applicant was the

first choice on eight of the member's lists, and the lowest applicant was on four of the member's lists. Twenty-two applicants were selected to be an SRO working group member, seven of those members declined to accept the invitation due to conflict of interest, time commitment, or did not respond to multiple attempts to contact using self-provided contact information (phone and email).

The City reviewed the list of members selected by the Advisory Board and recognized the need to add greater diversity. The City asked the Community Engagement teams from both the Mayor's Office and Chicago Police Department to recommend an additional eight persons to join the CWG. Nine additional community members were asked to participate, four of whom accepted. The CWG was made up of 19 members from neighborhoods across Chicago.

SUMMARY OF MEETINGS

Orientation Sessions

The orientation sessions were held on:

- Saturday September 12th, 2020 (11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)
- Monday September 14th, 2020 (11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.)
- Tuesday September 15th, 2020 (6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.)

The orientation session discussion topics were:

- The purpose of the working group
- The anticipated outcomes of the working group
- The etiquette for the working group
- The introduction of working group members
- The explanation of non-participatory attendees (this included an explanation of the facilitator and neutral note-taker role, the IMT, and members from CPD)
- The working group process and schedule
- The explanation that all information shared is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)
- The explanation of the consent decree requirements specific to the CPD School Resource Officer Policy

The members in each orientation session had similar questions. Some of the questions that were asked in the orientation sessions include:

- Can the goals of the working group be altered to include the removal of SROs from schools?
- What is the process to include Youth in this working group?

- Where can the group access the policy / special order / and MOU between CPS and CPD?
- What is the structure for providing feedback to CPS?
- Once the final policy is presented, it is required to be adopted and put into place?
- When do recommendations take effect?

The most significant question that was asked during all three orientation sessions was regarding the request remove SROs from schools. The City and CPD responded to this question by stating that the focus of the CWG was to review the current CPD SRO policy and make recommendations, but the CWG could include the recommendation to remove SROs from CPS high schools and, if it chose to do so, that recommendation would be passed along to CPD.

Working Group Sessions

Session #1 – September 17th, 2020

The session began with introductions for all members on the call, including non-participatory ones as this was the first time all participants were virtually “face-to-face”. The facilitator and note-takers introduced themselves and explained their role and asked the group if they had any questions. The Independent Monitor introduced herself and explained her observation role.

The second half of the session entailed small breakout groups that were randomly assigned. The facilitator asked each breakout room to “Imagine it is September 2021, SROs are in school, and everything is working perfectly. What do you see, what you not see?” This question was intended to start to generate big, actionable ideas. The larger group reconvened and shared out similarities and differences in the values and ideas.

The group wrapped up the session with the request from the City to review the information on the Microsoft Teams Portal that included the SRO policy, and the article on CPS’s website detailing the intergovernmental agreement proposed changes.

Session #2 – September 24th, 2020

This session began with a presentation from a representative of the CPD’s Research and Development unit to explain the policy review process for the first hour. The CWG members asked multiple questions, and a significant concern was the timeframe for the work. Many members did not feel that four weeks would be sufficient to review the policy and make recommendations. There were also concerns about the latest Intergovernmental Agreement not being available to the CWG as it was still being finalized.

The group reconvened after a short break to continue the discussion of the actionable ideas that emerged from the first session. A list of nine potential recommendations was created by the facilitator with group participation.

Session #3 – October 1st, 2020

The Chief of Safety and Security from CPS, Jadine Chou presented for the first hour of the session. Chief Chou discussed the Intergovernmental Agreement and what will be included in the revised version. The working group will have access to the agreement once it is made public. The main topic of Chief Chou's presentation focused on the community engagement efforts CPS has done which led to the agreement improvements. These include:

- New eligibility and selection criteria
- Prohibition of use of the Criminal Enterprise Information System
- Improved complaint process with direct complaints to COPA
- Increased training
- Explicit protection regarding immigration concerns
- CPD will immediately notify CPS of use of force incidents

The CWG members asked many questions and Chief Chou gave her contact information at CPS for any additional questions the group may have.

During this session, many members expressed frustration about the CWG process, and that removal of the SROs was not required by CPD to approve or decline. Deputy Director of Community Policing Mike Milstein addressed the group with the offer to meet with CPD leadership in the coming weeks, to discuss feedback on policy recommendations.

The remaining time was dedicated to a policy recommendation discussion to review the common themes from last week and for members to think about the recommendation "bucket" they would like to focus more time on. The facilitator asked that each small group draft their own recommendations with the voice they all agreed on.

The City created a survey for all working group members to select the "bucket" to be assigned and was sent via email.

Session #4 – October 8th, 2020

The facilitator reviewed the topic buckets from last week and the assignments of those were given out. The group discussed some additional questions the small groups should consider while drafting the recommendations. The group separated into breakout rooms based on the buckets of:

- Process
- Conduct
- Selection/Training/Hiring/Firing
- Catch-All
- Information and Data Collection

The remaining time of the session was used in the breakout room. In the last ten minutes of the session, the group reconvened and was asked to email the City their proposed

recommendations by October 13th, 2020. The City combined all documents and sent to the CWG members prior to the next scheduled session.

Session #5 – October 15th, 2020

The small groups each shared the proposed recommendations to the larger group for comments and questions. The CWG members gave feedback and made suggestions to edit the proposed recommendations. The Catch-All bucket was renamed Resource Allocation / School Budget. The group was tasked with incorporating all the revisions and sending to the City the final recommendations for voting.

The City sent to the working group an online poll with all recommendations from the group and the choice to select “Yes”, “No”, or “Abstain”. The voting results were sent back to the group, all recommendations were approved to be submitted to CPD. Please refer to Appendix 1 for the poll results.

Session #6 – November 2nd, 2020

The session was organized by CPD and was dedicated to verbally responding to the working group recommendations.

The CPD attendees:

Director of Community Relations - Glen Brooks Jr
Deputy Director of Community Policing - Mike Milstein
Office of the Superintendent Representative - Tina Skahill
General Counsel - Dana O'Malley
Acting Chief of Staff to CPD - Leslie Silletti
Research and Development - Lt. Michael Kapustianyk
Research and Development - Sgt. Thomas Stoyias

The City of Chicago attendees:

Deputy Corporation Counsel for Public Safety Reform - Tyeesha Dixon
Senior Policy Advisor for Public Safety - Angie Weis
Policy Advisor for Public Safety - Catherine Sanchez
City of Chicago Consultant (Hillard Heintz) - Marcia Thompson
Assistant Corporation Counsel for Public Safety Reform - Zoe Jones

The discussion opened by the CWG members recommending the removal of all SROs from CPS schools. The City and CPD heard this as the number one concern and recognized most of the voices from the CWG shared this concern. The Director of Community Relations related that while this was out of the scope of the policy, the CPD would bring this information to future discussions with CPS.

The group then asked for the response to each recommendation by Director of Community Relations and was given a verbal response of “accept”, “partially accept”, “do not agree”, “included in IGA”, or “consistent with policy”.

The session was extended by one hour to allow for continued response at discussion. At the end of the session, the CWG members expressed concerns that the response from CPD would be a “rubber stamp”. The CWG members also expressed appreciation for the facilitators but had concerns for the overall process and whether input will be valued. The CWG members expressed interest in continuing to meet without City or CPD in attendance. One of the CWG members shared her email address for others to contact her if interested in continuing to meet.

The City’s consultant from Hillard Heintz offered to host a session after the written response from CPD was shared, to discuss the working group process and how it could be improved. This Zoom session was only to include the consultant and the CWG members. The City sent out an invite to the working group members and the process meeting was scheduled for Wednesday December 9th, 2020.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A major component of the CWG was the ability to make recommendations to the Department throughout their review process of CPD’s School Resource Officer policy. The recommendations were to be specific to the SRO policy, however, the group was given the ability to make recommendations outside of the scope of the SRO policy, with the expectation that the ESC was not required to accept or reject the recommendation, but at least take it into consideration when the relevant policy to that recommendation was being reviewed next.

Process for Voting on Recommendations

The CWG developed the recommendations in small groups based on the “bucket” or topic the member felt most important. Recommendations for voting were drafted collaboratively by the CWG members and then a single document drafted by the neutral facilitator. The exact wording of each recommendation was included in the single document. The CWG then discussed the recommendations one last time for minor revisions. Each small group edited their “bucket”, and the final document was sent to the CWG members through a SurveyMonkey online poll. The voting results were shared with members after the 24-hour open period for voting.

Review of Recommendations by the Executive Steering Committee

Once recommendations were sent to the ESC, the ESC had ten days to review the recommendations and respond in writing to the CWG. The ESC had the ability to accept the recommendation as is, accept the recommendation with modifications, or reject the recommendation. The ESC provided a written response to all recommendations. Please refer to Appendix 2 for the CPD document “School Resource Officer (SRO) Community Working

Group Recommendations – Summary of Response and CPD Response to SRO Working Group Recommendations”

Recommendations

The ESC responded to 54 recommendations made by the CWG, of which 16 were accepted or accepted with modifications. Of the total number of recommendations made by the CWG, 11 of the recommendations were determined by the Department to already exist in the current Intergovernmental Agreement between CPS and CPD. There were 19 recommendations that fell outside the scope of the CPD SRO policy but had been presented to the ESC for consideration, and five recommendations that were a CPS-related concern. A total of three recommendations were not accepted by the ESC.

CONCLUSION

The School Resource Officer Community Working Group engaged community members in a discussion about the CPD SRO policy and what could be improved. The CWG was reflective of the diversity of Chicago and included many differing thoughts and ideas. The group engaged in open conversations that were appreciated and respected.

The group did share valid concerns that the Intergovernmental Agreement was not available until the end of the process. While this was not intentional, the City recognizes that the most updated agreement would have allowed for the best possible recommendations from the CWG, and will work to ensure that future community input groups have the most updated resources.

The City also recognizes the CWG members shared the concern that the process felt like a “box to be checked” by CPD, and that the input was not as valued as the members would have liked. The City will work to improve the process of community engagement in collaboration with CPD. The City values and appreciates the contributions of working group members and wants them to feel that their time has been well spent. The City’s consultant will provide a report on recommendations to improve the process and the City looks forward to incorporating those improvements into the next CPD School Resource Officer policy review.

APPENDIX 1

See attached

APPENDIX 2

See attached